# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,878	09/19/2003	Evan E. Kosłow	. KXIN 100027000	8886
22891 7590 10/16/2007 LAW OFFICE OF DELIO & PETERSON, LLC. 121 WHITNEY AVENUE			EXAMINER	
			FORTUNA, JOSE A	
3RD FLLOR NEW HAVEN, CT 06510		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
IND WITH VERV			1791	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

·	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/666,878	KOSLOW, EVAN E.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	José A. Fortuna	1791				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tiry within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed  /s will be considered timely.  In the mailing date of this communication.  ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 A</u>	ugust 2007.					
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applica prity documents have been receiv ou (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion Noved in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:					

Art Unit: 1791

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
  - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claims 1-7, 9-12, 14-22, 24 and 42-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 1, 9, 11, 14 and 20, the independent claims, the phrase "a cationic material that is residing on said at least portion of said fibers..." lacks of sufficient antecedent basis, since it was never established that the fibers included any cationic material(s)." It is also unclear if those counter ions are the active agents previously recited or some other particles, which were not described.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-7, 9-12, 14-22, 24and 42-47 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as anticipated by Giglia et al., US Patent No. 4,929,502 in view of Sawan et al., US Patent No. 5,817,325.

This rejection is set forth in the prior Office action mailed on April 17, 2007.

Application/Control Number: 10/666,878 Page 3

Art Unit: 1791

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on August 17, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that the secondary reference does not teach the precipitation of the biological agent on the fibers or the active particles, but they teach a coating of the microbiological interception agents. The arguments are not convincing for the following reasons:

Applicants argue only the secondary reference, while the rejection was based on a combination of references, i.e., a piecemeal analysis. Note that it has been held that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck* & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Coating the microbiological interception agent onto a substrate is only a preferred embodiment of the US'325 reference. Note that they teach that adding the interception agent can be done either by producing it, i.e., making it first, and then adding to the substrate or can be formed *in situ* in the substrate, see for example, column 4, lines 3 through 10. Moreover, the precipitation of additives onto papermaking fibers is well known in the art, (it is calling loading of the fibers), and therefore, loading the fibers with an antimicrobial intercepting agent would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Note that recent court decision, KSR, foreclosures the arguments that a specific teaching, suggestion, or motivation is required to support a finding of obviousness. See

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See for example US Patent Nos. RE 35,460, 5,679,220, 6,599,390, just to cite a couple.

recent Board decision Ex parte Smith, --USPQ2d--, slip op. at 20, (Bd. Pat. App. & Interf. June 25, 2007) (Citing KSR, 82 USPQ2d at 1396).

#### Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to José A. Fortuna whose telephone number is 571-272-1188. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven P. Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/666,878

Art Unit: 1791

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/José A Fortuna/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1791

Page 5

JAF